DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 451 SO 012 119

TITLE	Proceedings of Citizen Education Conference (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, February 14, 1978).
INSTITUTION	Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	78
GRANT	OB-NIE-78-0207
NOTE	55p.; For related documents, see SO 012 120-121
AVAILABLE FROM	Research for Better Schools, Inc., 444 North Third Street, Philadelphia, PA 19123 ($3.25)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Citizen Participation; *Citizenship; Educational Assessment; Educational Needs; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Practice; Elementary Secondary Education; Political Socialization; Program Development; School Community Cooperation; *Social Studies

ABSTRACT

The conference provided a forum where educators, members of public service organizations, and legislators could explore the need for and commitment to citizen education, set citizen education objectives, and generate ideas for creating a citizen education effort. Conference participants explored two major aspects of citizenship education--knowledge, skills, and attitudes conducive to citizen participation; and governance skills and opportunities such as discipline and decision making which are part of children's lives in the school, home, and community. Topics discussed include skills, political concepts, and attitudes which can help prepare students for changing world conditions; the need for school/community cooperation; gaps in student knowledge about political affairs; cognitive and affective objectives of citizenship education; curriculum development; characteristics of an ideal citizenship education program; citizen competence; and using students' everyday political experiences to help them understand the adult political world. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178451

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wilk Rouk

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROCEEDINGS OF CITIZEN EDUCATION CONFERENCE

HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
FEBRUARY 14, 1978

SP 012 119

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelpia, Pennsylvnia 19103

Published by **RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INC.**
Opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Grant OB-NIE-78-0207 with the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Copyright© Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD
Guidelines for Citizenship Education
Robert L. Schell v

PREFACE
Barbara Z. Presseisen ix

OVERVIEW 1

WELCOME TO PARTICIPANTS
Frank S. Manchester 3

A NEED FOR ACTION/SPECIFYING OBJECTIVES
Robert L. Schell 10

MORNING SMALL GROUP SESSIONS 15

PROMOTING CITIZEN COMPETENCE
Richard C. Remy 17

AFTERNOON SMALL GROUP SESSIONS 39

CLOSING REMARKS
Frank S. Manchester 42

FOREWORD

Guidelines For Citizenship Education

Citizenship education has traditionally been relegated to the area of the social studies. However, it is the contention of this program that citizenship education is a more pervasive and encompassing topic that must concern the educational process, both within the schools and the community if it is to have an impact. Citizenship education is an educational effort which seeks to teach all citizens the knowledge, skills, and attitudes which will enable them to participate effectively in our democratic society in a manner which contributes to the common welfare and is personally satisfying.

There are two major components of citizenship education. The most common one is concerned with the government of adult society. It is this aspect of citizenship education that the National Assessment of Educational Progress focuses upon: the knowledge, skills and attitudes that will enable the students of today to be better informed and active citizens in their community, state, nation and world. This includes governance on the personal, social and economic levels as well as on the political level.

However, abundant research indicates that the aptitudes of governance must become a part of the educational program in a meaningful way within the life of our children long before they are prepared to accept responsibilities in the adult world. For this reason, the second aspect of the citizenship education program is the everyday governance that is part of a

child's life in the school, home and community. The most obvious indicator of this aspect might be discipline but it goes far beyond disciplinary matters. Formal and informal opportunities must be provided within the structure of the school for students to make decisions and assume responsibilities (which can be engendered only through experiences that permit free choices).

There is a need to bridge the gap between these two aspects of citizenship education. This can be accomplished only through well-developed planning and articulation of educational goals and experiences, reinforced through cooperative interaction between schools and the community on both elementary and secondary levels.

The danger in this approach is the tendency to include everything in citizenship education; thus the program could become amorphous and unmanageable and the results questionable.

To clarify the boundaries of citizenship education, it is advantageous to classify some of the skills, attitudes and areas of knowledge that might be considered as important elements to educate our students for the citizenship role. Skills and attitudes are most effectively developed through a continuous and integrated program that involves students in educational experiences which relate to governance within their present life-style and developmental stage. The knowledge of the historical and contemporary affairs of political, economic and social issues is basic, but the following suggested areas include topics that have recently been suggested by national authorities as being important to broaden the perspective of citizenship

education to prepare students for our changing world conditions. The following listings are merely suggestive, and are offered as examples to provide guidance in further development of citizenship education programs.

SKILLS

Problem solving
Analysis of media
Valuing
Interpersonal skills
Conflict resolution
Application of decisions into action

ATTITUDES

Objectivity
Concern for others
Commitment to freedom
Responsibility
Commitment to equality
Integrity
Justice
Commitment to action
Commitment to rationality
Receptivity to change
Loyalty
Recognition of dilemmas of democracy
i.e., Individual vs. group welfare
Order vs. freedom
Loyalty vs. criticism
Energy vs. environment

KNOWLEDGE

Political concepts that are concerned with the allocation of power on local, state, national and international issues.

Law-related concepts that pertain to constitutional, criminal, civil and administrative law and areas of enforcement and correction.

Economic concepts that are concerned with priorities of governance.

Environmental and energy issues that are involved with the political areas of allocation of resources.

Global concerns that demand understanding, since decisions made in one part of the world link to governmental decisions within our own political structure.

Multicultural issues that are of great importance in a democratic, pluralistic society.

Family-parenting concerns. Since the basis of governance begins in the home and there is increasing data to suggest that poor citizenship attitudes are often a result of family-parental problems, it appears necessary to assist students in analyzing governance behaviors within the parenting role.

In order to achieve the suggested goals outlined in this paper, there is a need to expand the strategies for involvement of students in citizenship activities beyond the usual classroom setting. For instance, the use of the arts and humanities can often extend the sensitivities of children in understanding the realistic human aspects of citizenship attitudes and values. In order to allow students to expand their areas of responsibilities, it will be necessary to provide participatory activities both within the school and the community environments. In some cases this might be in the form of an alternative school, while in other instances these opportunities might be reflected in the formal and informal curriculum of the regular school. Each school and community should consider what best suits the needs of their students within the unique characteristics of their own environment. The important factor is the cooperative development of a program that includes planning by teachers, administrators, community people and students; citizenship cuts across all boundaries.

These broad general guidelines provide a framework for the development of individual needs assessments, implementation of programs, and research that will lead to the development of competencies to serve as more definitive guidelines for ongoing programs within the Commonwealth.

Robert L. Schell
Pennsylvania Department of Education

PREFACE

Every society is obliged to prepare its citizenry to be able to prosper and succeed in the adult life of the community. At the same time, the society must enable these same citizens to become effective participants in its governance and responsible members of the social groups constituting society itself. Throughout American history, different periods have characterized the best form of education to realize these obligations. Like history itself, each generation must redefine and implement citizen education in terms of contemporary needs and available resources. The same situation prevails today.

In a democracy, the improvement of citizen education instruction is not merely a matter of educational expertise or research capability. It is an enterprise intimately related to the goals of the society at large and, ultimately, to the ability of the educated to participate in the society and to shape its very purposes. This unique interaction underlies the collaborative relationship between RBS and the state educational authorities in the tri-state region of Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. As partners in a joint effort to improve citizen education, RBS and each state authority can: (1) determine what, in existing school situations, prevents the full educational development of effective citizens; (2) enlist the support of the community at large, through representative participants, to facilitate a statewide educational program to maximize citizen development; and (3) plan and implement such a statewide program according to the soundest principles of educational research and development.

There are two tasks RBS and the three state departments of education should attend to as they pursue their common purpose. Together, they should research, and then develop:

- a methodology that school practitioners can employ which enables them to develop various programs in citizen education, determine the delivery strategies which are most appropriate for their new programs, and assess or evaluate the effectiveness of their new citizen education programs.
- a replicable dissemination strategy so the improved methodology can be made available throughout the instructional support system of a given state, independent of the original developmental site or sites.

In sum, the major intention is to assist school practitioners to develop their own capability to apply R&D processes and products in the improvement of their delivery of citizen education instruction and to do so within the context of community involvement and participation.

Barbara Z. Presseisen
Research for Better Schools

OVERVIEW

The Citizen Education component of Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS) is exploring the possibility of establishing a partnership with statewide school improvement programs in a tri-state area (Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware) in order to assist those states in their efforts to enable students to become more effective participants in democratic society. One of the first outcomes of this exploration of RBS and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was a conference on citizen education, convened by Robert L. Schell, Chairperson of the Pennsylvania Citizen Education Committee. The conference was held on February 14, 1978, in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. In attendance were members of the State Department of Education, members of the Citizen Education component of RBS, representatives from other state educational and public service organizations, and an administrative assistant from the state legislature.

The objectives of the conference were:

- To explore the need for and the possible scope of citizen education;
- To develop tentative objectives for citizen education;
- To explore the interest in establishing a statewide commitment to citizen education;
- To generate ideas concerning procedures for the creation of a statewide citizen education effort.

Despite the fact that attendance was reduced because of a heavy snowstorm, the conference was successful in meeting these objectives. The persons who were able to attend expressed a need for citizen education and a commitment to responding to this need, as well as specific suggestions as to what the scope of citizen education should be. They also expressed a common sense of direction for their efforts. Their interest and enthusiasm in suggesting directions for citizen education in the Commonwealth and objectives for a citizen education program were limited only by the amount of the time alloted to the small group working sessions. There was also a generally positive reaction from the participants to the other conference sessions.

What follows is a transcription of the addresses presented at the conference (slightly edited for the printed page), a report on the work of the small discussion groups, and a report of the summation given at the end of the conference.

WELCOME TO PARTICIPANTS

The participants at the conference were welcomed by Frank S. Manchester, Commissioner for Basic Education in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Dr. Manchester reviewed the need for citizen education programs in the state and outlined the ways in which the state department of education, through Project 81, has begun to respond to those needs. His address is given below.

During my last year as superintendent of a suburban school district outside Philadelphia, an eighth-grade teacher gave her students a test on their knowledge of government. The results were, as you might predict, somewhat disastrous. These eighth-grade students, who had come through the social studies curriculum which we had spent a number of years devising, simply were not prepared to answer some basic questions about their own government. For instance, they did not know that there are three branches of government in this country.

More recently the Educational Quality Assessment (EQA) program [of the Pennsylvania Department of Education] repeated the test for the citizenship goal, this time including some knowledge elements as well as the attitudinal items used previously. As I recall the results, in the eighth grade test the students were asked to name the capital of the state of Pennsylvania. About 30 to 40 percent of the students didn't know. Some thought it was Philadelphia, which may be understandable. A few thought it was Washington. A number of them possibly correctly picked Harrisburg by chance.

Tha National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) report which appeared a week or two ago clearly indicated the same kinds of results across the nation in terms of basic information about the American govern-

ment and voters' responsibilities. The director of NAEP, speaking at a recent Project 81 conference, said that there had been a slight increase in the reading and math scores, but in citizenship the results showed a marked decline.

As I consider these test results, I am led to recall the long period before I came to the Commissioner's job, when I was working on curriculum, spending a great deal of time making all kinds of course changes and improvements in the area of social studies. I think of the pattern of what has happened in social studies over the last fifteen or twenty years. What was done, in fact, was to eliminate the European history course in favor of something called "world cultures." This was done for the very laudable motive, it seems to me, of helping our students to be more aware of what's going on in the rest of the world and to become less narrow in their viewpoint as they react to other cultures. But at the same time, the European history course was not replaced with anything that gave students some sense of the concepts within our Western heritage. I think that has been a great failing in terms of where we are now. We do not insist that children have to know certain content.

We also replaced the twelfth-grade program of Problems of American Democracy (POD) with a series of electives in psychology and sociology which the students enjoyed much more than the courses in civics and economics that had been formerly offered. This pattern is not true of all schools, of course, because some still have POD or comparable courses. But not very many do. I would guess that most of the suburban schools or schools that have spent a good deal of time on curriculum have dropped that particular program. They have a pattern that runs something like this: world cultures in tenth grade, American history in eleventh grade,

and social science electives in twelfth grade. Even in the seventh through ninth grades the old civic courses tend to have been pushed out in favor of other kinds of programs.

Therefore, if you look at what has been wrought in terms of curriculum change, you will find no place where students would have any kind of required and concentrated study of their government. I recall that when I came to the particular suburban school system I mentioned earlier, the students had perhaps too much study of the United States Constitution. But when I left that system, they had virtually none. And I suspect that this pattern has been repeated in a number of school districts. Now the results of this pattern are reflected in the NAEP and other test scores.

Am I saying that a social studies program ought to be completely oriented toward government or toward factual knowledge, such as the capital of the state or the three branches of government? No! But I do think that if students don't get that kind of factual knowledge base, then we are in very serious trouble.

Now, I don't think that the problem necessarily lies in the courses that we offer. We probably do not have to go back again and redo the courses themselves. But I think we must find out what it is that we want students to have in order to function as citizens in our modern American technological society. What is it they need to know? What is it they need to be able to do?

We have made a start on this task in Pennsylvania through Project 81. For the last year, in 12 model districts (city, rural, and suburban) across the state, Project 81 has been asking thousands of citizens the question: When a student graduates from high school, he should be able to

_____. We have literally hundreds of thousands of responses from all segments of the citizenry, telling us what they want their children to be able to do.

At the same time we are asking the State Board and the Intermediate Unit Boards of Education to take a look at the Quality Goals of Education set for the state and then to express in very general and broad terms what it is they want the educational program in the Commonwealth to do.

Those two efforts are now complete and we are trying to link the two. As a result a new citizenship goal is being drafted. In the first draft form which has now been accepted by the State Board, this goal reads:

> Quality education should assure that every child learn the history of the nation, and understand its systems of government and economics, and acquire the values and attitudes necessary for responsible citizenship.

The change here is mainly in emphasis. The previous goals stated the attitudes and habits of citizenry but did not accent the cognitive part included in the new goal, the knowledge base that I think has been lacking in a number of our programs.

At the same time Project 81 came up with literally hundreds of responses concerning what students should be able to do when they graduate. The responses included such items as: use voting procedures, meet tax responsibilities. select candidates for public office, use governmental services, understand documents, and interact with other individuals and groups. This base of competency statements will now be examined over the next three or four months to determine the kind of knowledge and skills that students will need in order to be able to do these things, and further, the kind of attitudes we want students to have as a result of these learnings. So the

end product will be a goal statement and a series of perhaps 15 or so competency statements encompassing skills, knowledge, application of the skills and knowledge in life-role situations, and attitudes -- all those things we think students ought to be able to do or to know. Those statements will, in fact, be the charge for the school district as one of the eleven major goals of the school system.

Now, how does the effort that Bob Schell and the department have launched in terms of looking at citizenship education fit into the picture? Well, we are not assuming in the Project 81 effort that we are necessarily going to find all the answers in the 12 model districts, although we do think that it is a substantial community base and very representative of the views of the citizenry across the Commonwealth. What we would like to see is a concurrent effort on your [the Citizen Education Committee's] part. We are anticipating the fact that there will be an accent and a need and a priority given to citizenship. We have now a group in the Commonwealth that is beginning to take a good look at the goal and competency statements we come out with in the area of citizenship education. We would like this group to give its substantive input to the final goal statement which will come probably in January of next year, and at the same time to try to anticipate what kinds of needs the schools have in terms of implementing these goal and competency statements -- not in the sense that we would mandate what should be done, but in the sense that we would provide a strong leadership role. We would say, "Here's what we think needs to be done in the programs across the Commonwealth."

I would plead with you [The Citizen Education Committee] to consider two things. One is that the schools need a better balance between the knowledge base and the application of the knowledge in real-life situations. John Dewey talked about the educational problem of framing major issues in either/or situations. But when he said that we needed to do more to give students opportunities to apply the knowledge and skills they learn in content areas to real-life situations, a number of people unfortunately took the ball and ran with it. They acted as if you didn't need any study in the content areas and you didn't need to develop any skills. Somehow the knowledge and skills would all develop naturally as you were involved in making maps, going out into the community to visit fire stations, and the like. Obviously, that didn't happen.

I think we have to be very careful in what we do to avoid getting into an either/or argument. I remember that the State Board, in beginning its discussions of all the goals and the citizenship goal in particular, was divided into two camps. One group was saying, "We just have to study the history and the rest of it will take care of itself," and the other group was saying, "We have to get these kids out into the community and give them the experiences they need as a citizen if they are ever going to function effectively." But what happened through that whole discussion process is what I hope will happen across this Commonwealth as we get further into the matter of what citizenship education should comprise. The two groups began to realize that both their positions are necessary. It is not an either/or matter. We have simply got to give

these students an opportunity to gain a solid knowledge base about their heritage and about their government and their economic system. But at the same time there must be built into the program opportunities for these children to apply those skills and knowledge, both in simulated experiences within the school and in real-life situations outside the school.

The second thing I would like you [the Committee] to consider is the need to give students some framework within which to develop their own citizenship skills. I think the best frame of reference we have is, in fact, our Western heritage as it has been expressed in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution, and perhaps we should also bite the bullet and take a good look at our religious heritage, something we have tended not to do for a variety of reasons over the last ten or twenty years.

So then, my plea is for a balanced approach to the whole issue of citizenship that would include a strong knowledge base as well as opportunities for application of skills in addressing the affective parts of citizenship. And secondly, I urge that we address directly the whole issue of how you interweave the value structure of the Western heritage for students to use as a basis for determining for themselves how they want to function as a citizen. My hope is that you [The Citizen Education Committee] will stay with this effort, help us in setting the goals and competency statements for the State Board, and help us to determine what kind of leadership role the State ought to play in this very important area of citizenship.

A NEED FOR ACTION/SPECIFYING OBJECTIVES

Following Dr. Manchester's address, Robert Schell, Senior Social Studies Advisor to the Bureau of Curriculum Services in the State Education Department as well as chairperson of the State Citizen Education Committee, spoke to the participants concerning the societal problems that have brought about a call to reinvigorate citizen education in the state. He concluded by outlining the activities which the assembled group might attempt to carry out. The text of Dr. Schell's remarks follows.

Last week I met with a group of State Department of Education people to discuss how we might relate to citizen education. It soon became obvious that citizenship is such a broad and pervasive topic that it is very difficult to put one's finger on it. We found ourselves discussing whether indeed we should try to deal with a task like defining "citizenship."

But there does seem to be a general need for education in this area. It's interesting; I have been in social studies long enough to have seen the pendulum swing back and forth. Every time there is a crisis, there comes a call to reinvigorate citizen education in some way or another. Let me pose the problems as I see them that have brought about this current demand. Some of them refer to the lack of a knowledge base which Frank Manchester mentioned; some refer to other areas.

Number one is the increased discipline problem; vandalism and crime as an aspect of our present society. I've been out of the classroom for

seven years and it is really difficult for me to relate to the real problems that are occurring in the schools today. But I know it is a very serious problem that is spreading from the cities outward; I think the cycle is almost completed. Citizenship education does have to do with behavior patterns and therefore is related to this problem.

The second problem is something that schools have very little to do with and yet it has a tremendous bearing on citizen education. That is the disenchantment with politics. The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) findings a few years ago showed that over 50 percent of the youth thought the political leadership did not care, were dishonest, etc. Pennsylvania politics seems to support this contention in spades. I could go on and on, but you are well aware of the situation, whether it's Watergate or the Marston affair or local examples of political malfeasance.

The third problem is changing family patterns. We have many, many more women working. We have many, many more families with only one parent. You have some patterns in which there are no parents involved, just the peer group siblings.

Another problem is the apathy that is existent -- the withdrawal syndrome. Children are turning to drugs, to religious cults, to any escapism that exists. It's awfully easy today to look for a way to escape.

Fifth, our society continues to be mobile. There was a very interesting little program on 60 Minutes recently which showed some mobile homes and asked, "Why aren't they mobile? Just the people are." The facts are that mobility hasn't decreased a bit; in fact, maybe it's increased.

Then there is the problem of television's effect. There is a great discussion as to what that effect might be. But it's not just the crime and violence on television; it's the fact that television has become the babysitter. Now there may be positive as well as negative effects, but television does influence society today.

There is also the depersonalization of our society. I work in a bureaucracy and it's depersonalized. Schools have increased in size and are depersonalized. But there, size is not the only key; there is also the matter of how the school operates. I tend to think -- and this was emphasized in social studies -- that we have to look at the entire environmental structure in the schools.

Finally, there are the low EQA and National Assessment scores which Frank Manchester already mentioned.

Now because of all these problems, there has been a ground movement for citizen education around the state and the nation. I attended a citizenship conference sponsored by USOE a year ago last September in Kansas City, which was concerned with these kinds of problems. The National Council of Social Studies has a task force with a priority on citizenship education. Many of you attended the first meeting of the Alliance for Citizen Education, an attempt to form a national organization in Philadelphia, which was not just composed of educators but also dealt with community groups, labor representatives and others.

So there is increased concern for citizen education. But there is another factor, too. If we just go back and attempt to resurrect Problems

of Democracy courses and other programs of that nature, that is not the answer. I was editor of several POD books and I couldn't concur with Frank Manchester more that the answer is not in the course structure, but in defining what is meant by citizen education. I always felt that we could go out and pick someone off the street to come into most POD courses and hold the bull sessions we had. Those courses really were not the answer.

There are some new movements in the field of education itself I think we have to take cognizance of. I won't elaborate on them, but there are law-related education (in which Pennsylvania has been somewhat of a leader) and global interdependence -- whether we are speaking of the economic, the environmental, the social, the political or the foreign policy aspects. These are concerns of all citizens. And there is another major move -- moral values education. Frank mentioned the fact that we were concerned in the original EQA test with attitudes and values. There is a whole host of approaches to this area. But in our pluralistic society, we still have to have commitment, from both individuals and groups, to some basic democratic principles: principles such as human dignity, justice, political integrity, and equality of opportunity. And the Kettering Foundation Survey indicated that 79 percent of the parents wanted moral education, despite the fact that we have heard things to the contrary in the press. Lastly, the social sciences have brought forth some ideas that we have to deal with: the economic realities, such concepts as power, sovereignty, authority, consensus, compromise, socialization, freedom, and decision making. These are concepts from different social science disciplines.

Now, what is the importance of your involvement today? I hope that we can redefine or start to redefine the scope of citizen education, not just as a concern of the social studies, although this may be the keystone. But it also involves a larger commitment of both formal and informal education -- the school and the community. One of the reasons for this meeting is to attempt to bring attention to this need for citizen education.

I also think it is important that we look at citizen education not just from the view of either one approach or another approach, but that we look at alternative programs. There may be more than one problem, and there may be more than one answer.

And finally, I hope this group can serve as a coordinator of activities -- of local, school and community activities, and of state and national activities. These are some of the things that we hope will transpire with our small groups today.

MORNING SMALL GROUP SESSIONS

This portion of the program was introduced by Russell A. Hill, Senior Research Fellow of the Citizen Education component of RBS. Dr. Hill first clarified the role of RBS in the state citizen education effort and in the conference, by pointing out that it is not the task of RBS to define citizen education for the state. Rather, the task of RBS is to facilitate and to assist the state department of education as it moves into the area of citizen education over the next several years.

The participants were then divided into two groups. One was chaired by Galen Godbey, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Education, with Nicholas Sanders, Research Coordinator for the Citizen Education component of RBS, serving as recorder. The other was chaired by Elizabeth Haller, Social Studies Advisor in the Bureau of Curriculum Services with Suzanne Root, Survey Coordinator for the Citizen Education component of RBS, serving as recorder. The principal task of the groups was to attempt to define what is meant by citizen education by stipulating their concerns in this area and the objectives they thought should be included in a citizen education program.

There was general consensus that a citizen education program should be:

1. Relevant. It should appear to be realistic to the students and should appeal to their interests.
2. Flexible. It should provide options for local districts and schools, with choices available in both objectives and actual programs.

3. Inclusive. The program should extend through all the years of schooling. It should seek to involve parents and the community and address itself to developing skills and attitudes as well as knowledge.

4. Integrative. It should seek to integrate the many diverse elements that are part of citizen education, including knowledge of legal documents (such as the federal and state constitutions and local charters), knowledge of local and state as well as federal government, decision-making skills, values education, and the implementation of the democratic principles of equity, justice, and rationality.

The objectives generated by groups covered the following areas:

1. Knowledge base in law and political structures, as well as social, political and economic issues.
2. Planning, inquiry, interpersonal, and decision-making skills.
3. Development of positive attitudes toward those in authority, and of concern and respect for all other persons.
4. Understanding of the rights and responsibilities of individuals, of economics, of government operation, of basic national, state and local documents, and of the basic concepts in the social sciences needed to analyze society.
5. Multiethnic studies.
6. Global education.
7. Community participation.

PROMOTING CITIZEN COMPETENCE

The guest speaker for the conference was Richard C. Remy, Director of the Citizen Development Program of the Mershon Center, Ohio State University. Speaking on "Promoting Citizen Competence," Dr. Remy offered eight criteria for use in designing new approaches to citizen education and raised three questions which should be considered in such an effort. His address is given below.

Let me start by noting that working on problems of citizenship education, in my judgment, is somewhat like trying to climb a mountain. You can see the goal in the distance, you can see generally where you want to go, but how to get there is really a very difficult question. You start to climb one route and you discover, although it gets you up a little way, that it's a blind alley. Then you have to retreat a bit and try another route. The new route takes you a little further, but again it is not a clear path to your goal. Over time and by successive approximations, you keep at it, hoping that eventually you will reach that goal and hoping that as you get closer, it will become more clear to you. But there certainly aren't any easy solutions.

My own work in citizenship education has been done at the Mershon Center, social science research and development organization at Ohio State University. I direct a program there called the Citizenship Development Program. This program seeks to serve as a link between the university community and the world of schools, the world of practice. Our assumption

is that both have something to learn from each other. On the one hand, universities generate new knowledge about the human condition, and the schools can benefit from that knowledge. On the other hand, universities have a great deal to learn from people in the world of the schools. The Citizenship Development Program tries to bridge the gap between the world of the universities and the world of the schools. From this experience I want to talk with you about two things. First, I want to suggest eight criteria for the work you are going to be doing in the months and years ahead. And second, I want to pose several questions for which I don't have the answers, but which I think may make an important difference in your work if you think about them. Let me begin with the criteria.

Criteria for New Approaches to Citizenship Education

1. *New approaches to citizenship education should make good use of existing materials and resources.*

This first criterion is one I won't spend much time on. Quite simply, I think that as you design new approaches to citizen education, you should remember to make good use of existing materials and resources. During the sixties and seventies some very good curriculum materials in the areas of social studies and citizenship were developed. I think that you want to try not to reinvent the wheel or spend your time in areas where there are good materials available. The sort of information gathering and research that RBS is doing will help to alleviate that problem, because they are going to be compiling information about existing materials, programs, centers and organizations. So, simply by way of a reminder, don't forget some of the good things that are already out there.

2. *New approaches to citizenship education should strike a balance.*

This second criterion is also a reminder. It is, try to strike a balance. We are constantly swinging back and forth in citizenship education. We seem to need to do things by extremes. Either we are doing all moral education or we are doing all legalistic, institutional education, or we are doing all affective education. Yet we know that competent citizenship involves a blend of all these things.

I think you must particularly guard against adopting a narrow, legallistic conception of citizenship. This view defines citizenship in terms of voting and the individual's relation to institutions of government. Voting is important, but we all know it is only one aspect of good citizenship.

In addition, be careful not to fall into what Fred Newmann calls the "Good Scout Syndrome," with citizenship for males and/or females defined in terms of the attributes found in the Boy Scout Creed: that is, the citizen is "trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent." I am not against those attributes as qualities of citizenship, but the danger is in defining citizenship as everything and therefore it becomes nothing. You have to strike some kind of balance between these two extremes. It's easier said than done, but you really should pose that as a criterion for yourselves. When you are developing programs ask, where are we on this potential continuum? Have we inadvertently drifted off so that what we are doing really represents a very legalistic, narrowly focused approach? Or, is what we are doing so broad that everything is relevant and therefore there is no way to distinguish citizenship from anything else?

3. *New approaches to citizenship education should enable children and adults to see the political in their everyday lives as personally meaningful.*

The third criterion I would like to suggest is that new approaches to citizenship education should enable children and adults to see the political in their everyday lives. That is, new approaches to citizenship education must be personally meaningful. I think that this kind of criterion excludes, then, any view of citizenship that simply equates politics with government or the formal institutions of government. When we take that approach in our citizenship education programs, we are really saying that citizenship is an adult phenomenon that children or students can study from a distance and for which they can prepare, but in which they cannot participate until they reach adulthood. Then they can vote, they can work in campaigns, they can pay taxes, they can run for office; in short, they can be citizens. When you take that approach to thinking about citizenship, it is very difficult to devise programs which are personally meaningful for students.

Some conference participants have called special attention to state government. I couldn't agree more. State and local government is very important for people. Yet, it is often difficult to devise ways to teach about state and local government in ways that excite seventh or ninth graders. But I think it can be done, if you think creatively about it and if you look at citizenship in a way that I am going to suggest in a moment.

To ask you to follow this criterion is, in effect, to say that the political world of the students you will be dealing with has at least two parts. The first part is what we normally think of as adult politics. We

know that our students are aware of the larger adult political world. They are aware of it because they read the newspapers, they see television, they hear their parents talking at the dinner table about politics and government. They are aware of the energy crisis, of inflation, of issues related to school financing or the Panama Canal Treaties. They know that all these things are going on. They hear about them. This is, indeed, part of their political world.

But there is another part which I think traditional civics programs have ignored. We may call this the natural political world. This is the politics that are found in students' everyday lives when they confront problems of governance. How do we govern our classrooms, how do we govern our school, how do we make rules for our club, how do we decide, when somebody new comes into our neighborhood, whether to include or exclude them? These are problems having to do with group governance, with how the various groups to which a student belongs manage themselves. These are political in a very fundamental sense, and this is the other side of the political world of students.

What I think you ought to do is to try to find ways to merge these two sides so that you can use the students' everyday political experiences to help them understand the larger adult political world. For example, take the phenomenon of decision making as a basic task of citizenship. Everybody has to make decisions. Students make decisions in their everyday lives; and I think you can move from teaching them about decision making in their everyday lives to teaching them about the fact that people who manage the groups which

we call the United States, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the State of Ohio, and the City of Harrisburg also make decisions. And in many ways, the fundamental elements of decision making are the same. When the mayor makes a decision, he/she has to think of alternatives, predict consequences, and set goals in terms of what is valued. So I think there are ways to move back and forth between the world of adult politics or public issues and the everyday political world of the student. You need to try to do that if you are going to make civics programs personally meaningful.

4. *New approaches to citizenship education should build competence with enduring tasks and tensions.*

The fourth criterion I want to suggest is that new approaches to citizenship education should develop people's competence with the enduring tasks and tensions of citizenship. In an earlier conference session a list of goals was posited for citizenship education. I think the goals are very sound -- "understanding the legislative branch of government, understanding the national government, understanding economics, understanding moral development, understanding . . ." My question is, what is this understanding supposed to be for? How is it to be used? My suggestion is that it should be used to help people become more competent with the tasks they face everyday as citizens and which are inescapable.

Let me give you just a few examples of tasks which I think are faced by all citizens, rich or poor, black or white, urban or rural dwellers. People face the task of acquiring valid and reliable information about political issues and problems that they confront daily. This task is becoming increasingly difficult as we have an information explosion in our society. Today

we are literally inundated with a Niagara of information and statistics about our social life. We hear about birth rates, death rates, inflation, social mobility, air pollution, environmental quality and so on. As the complexity of information increases, it requires more and more skill to sort out reliable and valid information and to make intelligent decisions about the many factual claims hurled at us.

A second task is making moral and pragmatic judgments about people and public issues and politics. Everybody faces this task. Some people may handle it competently and others may handle it incompetently. Rich people may have more resources to deal with that task than poor people but the task is inescapable.

A third basic task of citizenship is taking action in political situations. At some time or another in their lives, unless people are living as hermits, they face the challenge of trying to influence the decisions of others. Whether it be to influence the state legislature to change the speed limits on the highways, to influence one's neighbor not to put up that 17-foot fence, or to influence a local mayor or city council member that your area really needs rezoning.

Good citizenship education programs should focus on building competency with these kinds of basic tasks. They should ask, what does someone need to know to acquire reliable and relevant information? What does someone need to know to influence political actions? Indeed, I would argue that you need to know a great deal about the legislative process if you are going to exercise influence. Even if you are not going to exercise influence, if you are only

going to exercise sensible judgment, you have to have some basic understanding of the legislative process. But, I want to suggest that you first think in terms of tasks and what it is that people have to do in their daily lives. Then apply what we know from the social sciences, what we know from history, and what we know from other bodies of knowledge to helping people with those tasks.

By "tensions" I mean a set of enduring dilemmas that are inescapable in our social life. Let me give you three examples. One, under what conditions should I as a citizen of a family, or as a citizen of a city, a nation, or as a citizen of a global community, be proud of and loyal to my group, and when should I be critical? There are times when loyalty is called for, and there are times when criticism is called for. This was a real tension in citizenship during the Vietnam War.

Second, under what conditions should I as a citizen comply with the laws or the norms or the rules of my group and support its political authorities -- whether they be the principal or the governor or the President -- and when should I defy the rules and authorities? Again, a very basic tension of citizenship.

Third, under what conditions should I as a citizen of a group actively participate in the political life of the group and, if necessary, sacrifice for the common good and when should I assert my privateness and withdraw? There may be times when the most sensible thing to do as a citizen is to get out, get away, withdraw, don't participate. And other times, the best thing to do for both one's own benefit and the welfare of one's group is to participate. I'm not suggesting that we provide students with the answers; I'm

suggesting we equip people with the knowledge and skills to cope better with these tensions.

5. *New approaches to citizenship education should recognize that increasing global interdependence is changing the nature of citizenship.*

It is really terribly important to recognize the effect of increasing global interdependence. It is changing the nature of citizenship and it is affecting citizenship education. Harlan Cleveland wrote that we should recognize that global interdependence is not something to be for or against, but a fact to be lived with now and reckoned with in the future. So I think in this country we are past the days when people were debating whether interdependence was a good thing or not, as if they could ignore it if they concluded it was not good.

The question is, what are the implications of interdependence in designing citizenship education programs? I would say at a minimum the implications of global interdependence are that people now confront these enduring tasks and tensions of citizenship, which I mentioned earlier, in a global or internationalized context. Longshoremen when they decided not to load grain on ships bound for Russia were making what we might call individual foreign policy decisions. They were coping with the task of citizenship, making decisions in a global or international context.

The second implication I would suggest is that local global linkages, the ways in which our own cities and states are linked to the rest of the world, mean that citizenship in our city or our state or our nation is not something apart from global citizenship. A recent example can be found at Ohio University. The Board of Trustees there recently voted to withdraw all

university investments in firms dealing with South Africa. That is a foreign policy decision made by a local group and it had nothing to do with the national government of the United States or with Henry Kissinger or with Cyrus Vance. It is a foreign policy decision made by individual citizens. And it wouldn't be made, I would say, if we weren't living in an increasingly globalized context.

Programmatically, I want to suggest that in the future we must try to infuse a global perspective across all areas of the curriculum. This will be hard to do because we have an ice-cube tray situation in the curriculum. All our courses are distinct entities, frozen in place. If we want to put a new "cube" in, we have to take an existing "cube" out. For example, a principal recently told me that the State Department of Education in Arizona has mandated a semester of free enterprise instruction for eighth and ninth grades. Arizona principals must now try to figure out how to do that. The problem is that if a free enterprise cube goes in, something else has to come out.

I would suggest that for some subjects and topics, that is perhaps appropriate. But is is not appropriate for global education because we are dealing with a phenomenon which is of a different order, logically and empirically, than, for example, free enterprise education. Global perspectives should be infused across the board in the curriculum to the extent that we can do it.

6. *New approaches to citizenship education should recognize that citizenship is becoming more complex.*

Sixth, new approaches to citizenship education should recognize that citizenship is becoming more complex. Our country was once a very simple society and today we are a very highly complex society. As social complexity increases, the tasks of citizenship increase in complexity. As the tasks of citizenship increase in complexity, then citizenship education becomes more problematic and challenging. There are a lot of factors affecting the growing complexity of citizenship. Some were mentioned here this morning: changing family patterns, increasing social mobility, the mass media, the information explosion. Big government is certainly another. American citizens are increasingly becoming consumers of government services at all levels -- local, state, and national. The growth of government is most noticeable at the national level, but it is occurring at all levels.

Let me give you some examples. While our nation's population has multiplied 53 times in the last 185 years of our history, the number of federal government workers has multiplied 1500 times. A year's spending by the federal government in George Washington's first term would only pay for about seven minutes of federal expenditures today and that's with inflation accounted for. In spending last year an amount equal to almost one quarter of the country's total output of goods and services, federal government workers wrote about 772 million checks.

These are some interesting illustrations that indicate that government is indeed growing. And as government grows at all levels, the task of citizenship becomes more difficult. Take the task of decision-making, for example. Acting as consumers, citizens in the 1790's didn't have to face nearly the range of complexity of decision that their contemporaries face today. Not only must a citizen today decide which auto loan terms are better, but the citizen must also decide whether to buy a large car to to buy a small car in support of an evolving national energy policy. The citizen must decide not only whether to purchase saccharin, but also whether decisions by the Food and Drug Administration limiting the use of saccharin because of supposed cancer risks really apply in their situations, or whether the Food and Drug Administration is right in the first place. Citizens who buy a defective product must not only cope with the task of confronting the dealer who sold them the product; buy in all likelihood they may become embroiled in dealing with both local and state government consumer protection agencies.

The point is obvious. The government is increasingly intruding in our lives. I'm not making a normative statement whether that is good or bad; I'm trying to make an empirical statement that the growth of government is making it increasingly difficult to be a citizen today. We see many indications of this. Why are we hearing so much about alienation and cynicism? It may have a lot to do with the fact that people are experiencing increasing difficulties in coping with big government at all levels.

7. New approaches to citizenship education should recognize that citizen education involves complex processes of human development.

The seventh criterion to recognize as you develop new programs is that citizenship education involves complex processes of human development. Let me suggest four facets of this that I think are important.

One is early learning. Quite simply, the process of becoming a citizen doesn't start in ninth-grade civics. It starts much earlier in life. Certainly, from your point of view, it starts in kindergarten. I'm not going to suggest that therefore we need a citizenship education slot in the kindergarten curriculum, but we do need to work at the elementary school level as well as at the high school level. It's harder to work at the elementary school level because the students there aren't like us. It's often like working with a foreign culture. Young children are different. They are little. They are in a different stage of cognitive and moral development and hence think differently. They have different interests. It is much easier to work with programs for high school students, who are really sort of younger college students and are much more familiar to us. I would suggest to you that a real challenge is to try to work at the early level because learning begins early.

The second point is that learning is continuous and cumulative. Quite simply, political learning builds on itself. So what we learn at grades 5 and 7 and 11 is a base for what we learn later and how we behave later. Political socialization researchers have had difficulty trying to draw direct linkages between students' attitudes about the presidency and adult attitudes towards the presidency. They found that there is no direct link, but that learning is indeed cumulative and does build on itself.

Third, there are several explanations of learning. Kohlberg, Piaget and other cognitive development theorists represent one school of thought about how people learn and develop. People like Albert Bandura and other social learning theorists represent another whole school of thought. When you think about citizenship education programs in practical terms, when you are hiring consultants and so on, make sure you get several points of view represented because there is no one theory in human development which explains how people become citizens and how they become competent or incompetent.

Finally, there is global learning. What I want to point out here is that the process of developing as a citizen isn't confined solely to developing knowledge and attitudes about state politics, national politics and family politics. Just as in the Middle Ages, people were subjects of a local kingdom, a larger kingdom, and the Holy Roman Empire; so today we are simultaneously citizens of the family, state, and nation, and in some sense, the globe. The typical American develops attitudes and some scattered bits of knowledge and information not just about local politics and how a bill becomes a law, but also about how nations negotiate with each other and about war, peace and imperialism. Global learning is, indeed, a part of citizen development.

8. New approaches to citizenship education should recognize that citizen education is not confined to schools.

My final criterion is that new approaches to citizenship education should recognize that the process is not confined to elementary and secondary schools. I think that most of us agree in principle with this criterion but in reality we do not act that way. As things stand, social studies education and social

studies educators equate citizenship education with schools and with schooling. Within schools and schooling they think of citizenship education in terms of what is called the social studies curriculum, a particular sequence of courses and subject matter from grades K through 12. Over the years this focus on schools and schooling has come to set the boundaries for what are considered legitimate and normal professional activities within social studies. These boundaries are hardly ever questioned. Social studies educators never think about the implications of this focus and they rarely think about their field in terms of other categories.

I would like to suggest that in addition to the schools, there are at least seven other agents or shaping forces in society that are affecting citizenship education. These are: government, business, labor, mass media, voluntary organizations, religious organizations, and primary groups.

Government agencies and institutions at the local, state, and national levels are involved in citizenship education. For example, local government, whether they want to or not, often need to stimulate citizen participation in order to obtain certain types of federal funds. The U.S. military regularly conducts citizenship education programs for thousands and thousands of young people who are inducted into the armed services. Citizenship education <u>is</u> being conducted by the government.

Both business and labor have a stake in citizenship education and try to educate citizens. Often we don't think of this. It is hard to think of examples because we haven't been looking for citizenship education in these places, but they do occur. If you talk with labor leaders or people who are in the labor movement, they are involved. The AFL-CIO has been involved in

citizenship education for years and years and years. So has the Chamber of Commerce, as have a number of large corporations with programs both for their employees and, in certain situations, for young people.

Voluntary associations such as the League of Women Voters or the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts have been for years engaged in exemplary citizenship education programs.

Religious organizations are involved in citizenship education. Weekly, millions and millions of Americans and their children receive instructions with respect to moral judgment making and moral behavior in many ways related to citizenship, when they attend worship services

Finally, the media, as you are aware, acts as an agent of citizenship education as do primary groups. Certainly citizenship education occurs both in the family and amongst peers.

I think it is very important, as you think about developing new approaches to citizenship education, to recognize that the process is not confined to schools and schooling, that we know very little of what is going on outside, and that as a matter of fact, much of what goes on there may directly contradict what we are trying to do in the schools.

In summary now, I have suggested eight criteria to guide your work: (1) use good materials if they exist; (2) strike a balance; (3) create programs that are personally meaningful; (4) focus on basic tasks; (5) infuse a global perspective;(6) recognize that citizenship is becoming increasingly complex; (7) use instructional variety; and (8) go beyond schools and schooling.

Questions to Consider

In conclusion let me pose three questions for you to consider. The first is, what in fact are the real limits of formal education in altering the behavior of people as citizens? Rhetorically, we pay lip service to the proposition that schools cannot teach students everything. We appreciate that people bring to their citizen roles personalities that are shaped by the larger culture and such agents as I have talked about -- the family, the government, the mass media, and so on. Yet, I challenge you to show me one empirically based, reasonably precise model of just what it is the schools can and cannot contribute in citizenship education. We really don't know.

We do have some glimmers. It seems that schools are more effective in imparting knowledge than attitudes. Political socialization research seems to indicate that social studies programs, at least, have had very little effect on student attitudes, whereas they do have some effect under certain conditions in developing student knowledge.

We also do not know which institutions in society, whether they are the schools, the family or whatever, are the best "carriers" of which parts of citizenship education. I'm not suggesting that you find the answer to this question, but I am saying that it is a question which really makes a difference. Over the years the schools have attempted to take in increasing numbers of functions. They have become responsible for many jobs that they were not originally accountable for. In some sense, maybe the time has come to try to reverse this trend. Perhaps educators need to assert that everything cannot be done in the schools. Rather, schools are the institution in society that possesses a particular set of resources. Schools,

for example, may not be very well-equipped to develop students' moral capabilities. But schools do possess considerable resources to develop students' knowledge, whereas we would not expect parents to be sources of technical knowledge about the intricacies of the national government or about federal policies.

The second questions is, what would your role and activities look like if you redefined your interest in citizenship education to include educational activities related to each of the sectors involved in citizenship education today? Not just the schools, but the government, families, mass media, voluntary organizations, business and labor. Let me suggest three very specific programmatic activities that are not to my knowledge being attended to by anyone in your position and in which I think Pennsylvania would have a chance to occupy a national leadership role.

One is the coordination and monitoring of citizenship education efforts involving the different sectors of society that I just mentioned. We know that fragmentation and duplication characterize citizenship education today. We know that people involved in school-based citizenship education really know very little about what is going on in the other sectors of society. You could develop the expertise to provide leadership in the coordination of school and nonschool educational programs. As experts in school-based citizenship with a very legitimate access to the schools, you could design programs which could more effectively coordinate learning activities within the schools with those in other sectors of society.

My second programmatic suggestion is research on citizenship education in nonschool settings. Really significant, long-term improvements in citizenship education are ultimately going to depend upon our expanding our research

effort to the total process of citizenship education, not just to the segment that occurs in the schools. I would like to suggest very quickly two or three research questions. One, we need some contextual mapping. We literally do not know what is going on. I challenge you to find anywhere in the literature of social studies education so much as a description of citizenship education programs in anything other than the schools. You can't find it because it isn't there. We have no idea what is going on. Second, we need research which evaluates the effectiveness of such programs. How effective is the League of Women Voters program? What can we learn from it? What might the League be doing better? Third, we need to assess the relationship between efforts in school and those in nonschool settings. What interactive effects are there when a student becomes involved in one of the new YMCA programs that link one city with the rest of the world and when that student undergoes the experiences he is exposed to in school?

Finally, a third programmatic activity might be the development of adult education programs to build citizen competence. Why is it that we think we have to teach everybody everything about citizenship before they graduate from high school? To give you one example: We know that a significant number of people, at some time in their lives, are going to become involved with the local courts. There are many good legal education programs around and they should be continued. But why do we think that a legal education program in the ninth grade is going to help someone who is 35 years old who is suddenly arrested. First of all, many things the person learned about the courts are likely to have changed. Court structure has probably changed; the building

is down here instead of over there, and so forth. Secondly, most people at that age are likely to remember only a very small portion of the specifics of how to protect themselves in the legal system. What I am saying is, there is a need for adult citizenship education. As society becomes increasingly complex, there is an increasing need for educating older citizens when they need the education. That is, there may be no need for a person to learn a lot about the local court structure unless a need to use that structure arises. But when one needs to learn, there should be a program available.

Another example is how to access health services. We need programs for senior citizens, teaching them as citizens how to get better access to a variety of state, local and federal health programs that are available. One can think of a number of topics like this. I would really hope that you would at least consider them as you think about developing new approaches in citizenship education.

One final question, do students have the same motivation to develop citizenship skills as they do to develop reading and writing skills? Peer pressure to read is enormous on students. But are those peer pressures there for something called citizenship skills? We rarely hear students say, "Hey, she can't make a decision" or "He doesn't know anything about local government." If the answer to this question is that the motivation is different, then maybe we need to reorient some of our thinking. Maybe one of the real challenges in citizenship education today is to develop student motivation to learn, and if we develop the motivation, a lot of the learning will take care of itself. Our students will learn if they are motivated to do so.

Citizen education is a continuing challenge. Over the years some of our very best social thinkers have worried over the task of preparing the young to take their place in society. People like Plato, Aristotle, Locke, Rousseau, de Tocqueville, Jefferson, Dewey and others have thought very seriously about citizenship education. So I would suggest that you are in very good company as you work on new approaches to citizenship education in Pennsylvania. Good luck!

A discussion period followed Dr. Remy's address, with participants addressing themselves to many of the points which Dr. Remy had raised, but most especially to the motivational factors he mentioned. It was suggested that society itself must make clear that out of its own self-interest it values citizenship skills as much as reading and math skills.

Another participant suggested that sending students into the community to practice the skills they had been taught might serve to increase motivation. This comment in turn suggested some stumbling blocks to such a practice. Among these were: scheduling problems, students who criticize the organizational structure of the school or other institutions in the community, and the community attitudes toward having students sit in on community meetings and operating sessions of local government. The question was also raised as to the purpose of citizen education; is it simply to transmit values of the past or is it to help new standards and values to evolve? And concurrently, what might happen if the values which emerge from the teaching of citizenship skills are not the values of the students' families and/or peers?

Possible answers to these questions included the suggestion that the schools might extend their citizenship education programs to the students' parents, presenting them in evening classes. Another suggestion was that schools should welcome community participation in the schools in order to break down the walls that exist between the school and the community. School facilities could be made available to the public. Adults might be more receptive to students in their midst if they had a more positive attitude about their own relationship to the schools.

AFTERNOON SMALL GROUP SESSIONS

Following lunch the two small groups met again, this time to suggest strategies for developing a statewide effort in citizen education and to brainstorm tasks which might be involved.

The strategies which were suggested included the following:

1. Deal with the relationship of state to local districts by
   a. allowing a wide latitude of choice among objectives, values, and other aspects of a citizen education program;
   b. agreeing on common basic documents to be studied in citizen education programs;
   c. urging that some directions be followed which are considered more common and more important and leaving other directions open to local option; and
   d. mandating a general statement concerning citizen education and allowing the local districts to fill in the specifics.
2. Enlarge the membership of the state citizen education committee to include representatives from other sectors of the community, such as business, labor, voluntary organizations, and various racial/ethnic interest groups.
3. Integrate the citizen education effort with the back to basics trend but be careful not to tie it to any current fads; rather allow it to build a case on its own merits.
4. Involve all segments of the community in all committee efforts from conceptualization to implementation.

5. Initiate research into those resources in the community available for or engaged in citizen education.
6. Enlist state legislators in the citizen education effort by helping them to identify their role, providing them with information, and lobbying for their support of citizen education.

The tasks that were brainstormed covered a wide and varied range of activity. Some of these tasks were:

1. Build a framework of what constitutes citizen education knowledge, skills and dispositions.
2. Develop a definition of citizen education for Pennsylvania that is based on input from a broad selection of participants and that encompasses the concerns of those participants. (Local districts could then select from that definition those parts that address local concerns.)
3. Hold a statewide conference involving persons in labor, business, and other sectors as well as educators to show what is now going on in citizen education.
4. Develop pre- and in-service teacher training programs in citizen education.
5. Hold public hearings on citizen education.
6. Create a student group, similar to the FFA, called Future Politicians of America.
7. Notify related legislative and other groups about the work of the state citizen education committee.
8. Obtain a source of financial support for the work of the state citizen education committee.

9. Create a Joint Council for Citizen Education outside of the State Department of Education.
10. Develop a long-range plan to include the relationship of citizen education to other areas of the curriculum, the evaluation of outcomes of planned tasks, etc.

CLOSING REMARKS

A brief commentary on the report of the two small group sessions was offered by Robert Schell and by Barbara Presseisen, Director of the Citizen Education component at RBS. Dr. Schell noted that in both of the small groups there had been great emphasis on the balance needed in new approaches to citizen education, a balance between cognitive and affective approaches as well as a balance among approaches directed to developing knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Dr. Presseisen noted that there is a need for a guiding group in citizen education which would represent the official education establishment in Pennsylvania but which would also go beyond education and reach out into many areas of the community. Such a group would need a long-range plan, but there are communications tasks in which it could become engaged at once through conferences, public hearings, surveys and other studies.

Dr. Manchester then delivered some closing remarks, responding to issues raised by the small group reports and the commentaries on them. His remarks follow:

I think Bob Schell's idea was that we should get people together representing the various educational organizations in the state to get some sense of how you feel you might participate in the process of dealing with citizenship education in the Commonwealth. I have gotten some sense of what you are concerned about. I think, however, you cannot operate as if you exist in isolation. All projects of this kind in the Department now are being plugged

into the combination effort of the State Board and Project 81. It's a two-way flow. Project 81 and the staff of the 12 model districts do not exist in isolation from the Department. They have to listen to, and be cognizant of, all the projects that are going on. We hope that the soon to be gotten off the ground citizenship project, along with other programs that either have been ongoing or have started recently, will deal with what educational programs in the state should look like. On the other hand, it seems to me that a group like this needs to draw from what Project 81 has been able to do and will be doing over the next few months. I noticed that you talked about interviewing a lot of people. Project 81 coordinators and staff have spent the last year interviewing, in groups and individually, literally hundreds of thousands of citizens within the cities of Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Erie and Lancaster; in a number of Bucks County districts, Upper Merion and other suburban districts; and in a number of rural districts. These interviews asked citizens of all backgrounds what they wanted the schools to do in citizenship education and what were their major areas of concern. What comes out of that will be a goal statement and a set of competencies which will in fact provide the framework for the next couple of years in terms of what we will be doing in this critical area of citizenship education.

What I would like to see this group do is to provide some input to that goal statement and the competency statements which will be put into their final form in the next seven to eight months. And then, I would like you to make suggestions as to what the state can do in its present program or in

changing that program in order to deliver on that goal and those suggested competencies. In fact, I would like you to say from your own background how well we are doing and what does the state need to do not to mandate, but to provide leadership in the area of citizenship education.

This morning I think I talked a little bit too much about the knowledge component. I feel equally strongly about the fact that the school exists as a community and teaches a lot to children outside of the social studies classroom, as well as within it. One of the areas that we are very interested in is the discipline study, which started out as the student rights and responsibilities study some three or four years ago. It seems to me that there we have some golden opportunities to reach children in ways they are not being reached in the adult world. It is my feeling that the adult criminal justice system and the juvenile justice system are not working very well. The same problems exist right now in the school justice system. In the adult world the person is paroled time and time again. In the schools the parallel situation is that the student is suspended over and over again. The same kinds of alternatives that the judges are looking for to handle the seriously criminal or the seriously destructive person are simply not in existence. In both sectors there are the same problems, the same concerns, the same lack of even-handedness and fairness. It does seem to me that the schools, which up to this point have been able to control their own discipline situations, could set up a system which perhaps the adult world could use as a model; a system in which we could adminster justice fairly, where there could be alternatives for the students, where justice could be both fair and firm, and where rights could be recognized but responsibilities also enforced.

One of the proposals that I made to the superintendents was that we address the whole question of the way students feel about public property. We might do this by having as part of the high school experience the requirement that students participate, at least for a portion of their time, in the care of public property -- school facilities, the school building, or some other public property. I have had experience, and maybe some of you have also, in schools where there wasn't enough money for custodial service for them. I was told that in Philadelphia, during the custodial strike at the beginning of this school year, most of those buildings were better kept during the strike than they were when the janitors were there, simply because students and their parents pitched in and worked.

We haven't tapped that kind of citizenship responsibility in our school efforts for a variety of reasons, but it seems to me that a citizens' group of this kind could begin to point the way not only to a stronger knowledge component being offered in the schools, but also to how the school operates as a community and as a model, a learning experience for our students. I would hope that this group would get excited about doing that.

One of the things that I will be looking for is that with each of the 11 goals of quality education that the State Board is determining, there will be some leadership effort on the part of the state to deal with each particular issue. With each one of these goals, I hope that we will have groups comparable to this as we begin to generate some leadership on the part of the state to improve instruction.